



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in the new uplift. The youth is no longer dependent upon the newspaper for his knowledge of World Politics. An intelligent study of foreign affairs is at last regarded as of as much importance as a study of the past. To broaden the young man's vision of the world, prominent educators are even advocating traveling fellowships. In twenty-five of the larger universities of America an Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs is establishing the groundworks for a wider international fraternity. Plans are already under way to have an organized delegation of more than a hundred students of all nationalities present at the third Hague Conference. Day by day the problem of world unity is becoming more deeply imbedded in the mind and thought of the rising generation. More and more is youthful patriotism becoming a realization of the truth that "Above all nations is humanity." The lure of war is losing its magnetic power and the brotherhood of man becoming more and more an international reality. A sentiment for universal peace is sweeping the world, and behind the defences of advancing civilization, armed with the strength of a purpose lofty and unselfish, stands an army of America's young men, mustered from the nation's colleges, enlisted to serve for an eternity, and invulnerable in the protection of a new and a conquering ideal.

Therefore the significance of the young man in the world's affairs today is something more than a fancy. Again and again the plea for world harmony hears a response in the changing ideals of a new generation. The growing sentiment of the educated youth of Japan finds its crystallization in the efforts of Count Okuma toward the consummation of world disarmament. The spirit of the youth of England finds expression in the ambitious dream of George V, whose hope it is to tie the bond of Anglo-Saxon unity torn asunder by George III. Among the young men of Russia the life of the great philosopher of world citizenship has left a lasting conviction of the senselessness of war. Even in imperialistic Germany the reckless building of Dreadnaughts brings out a vigorous and uncompromising protest from the thinking youth of the land. In America a vision of the international parliament of man, growing large in the minds of her leading statesmen, finds expression in the continued philanthropy of a great industrial king. Most significant of all, these are the world-wide examples that the college man enthrones in the empire of his thoughts. Sixty thousand European students, bound together by the cosmopolitan ties of a peace Fraternity, have ceased to glorify the triumphs of the battle-field. The commentaries of the hero-worshiper today do not record the names of a Marlborough or a Bonaparte. Rather does the young man find his idols in the more humble annals of a Tolstoy or a Sir Edward Grey. The new ideal of international peace is not merely the religion of a few enthusiasts. In an individual way these apostles of peace serve to voice to the world the spirit of the unnumbered thousands of obscure men whose lives and talents are directed, not to the construction of material kingdoms, but to the building of a better and more world-wide brotherhood.

Such is the hope of peace. The nation's critics may continue their indictment, and, pointing out the crises of the hour, paint in dismal hues a picture of the problems never to be solved except by shot and shell. Her skeptics, blinded by thought of the errors of the past,

may prophesy the desecration of her honor and the disappointing failure of her hopes. The press may pen a graphic story of the military spirit of the age, and frowning patriarchs relate the deeds of golden days gone by. But underneath this cloud that overhangs, and almost hidden in the gloom of history's disparagement, the new world-citizen discerns the birth-light of a brighter and more steadfast star, the young apostle of the new ideal perceives the coming triumph of justice and peace, and the awakened eyes of expectant America look forward with promise to the dawn of that new day when a nation shall be judged by the weight of its cross, and not by the wealth of its crown.

### The Arguments Against Arbitration.

With the drafting by the Administration of an arbitration treaty embodying the principles laid down by President Taft, and accepted with so much cordiality at the recent great London meeting on the subject, the question of international peace on the lines of international arbitration enters a somewhat new phase. It has passed, as Sir Edward Grey said at the London banquet to the Colonial Premiers last Tuesday, from the stage of theoretical discussion into the domain of practical politics. It is inevitable, and it is also right, that with this change in the character of the debate new views of the general question should appear. Opposition, which has been nearly or quite silent while arbitration was discussed only on a philanthropic and non-practical basis, will naturally, and again rightly, raise its voice in an aggressive way. This is the basis of all sound and successful public discussion of matters of this sort, and no great problem such as arbitration ever has been or ever will be settled finally, except after thorough and complete consideration of arguments on both sides of the question.

It must not, moreover, be supposed that because the general principle of arbitration appeals to thinking minds, there are therefore no legitimate obstacles which statesmen will take into consideration. We do not refer specifically to Mr. Roosevelt's recent article, opposing the full scope of the international arbitration plan. On the contrary, it seems to us that the ex-President's imagined instances, of reassertion by Great Britain of its old claim to right of search, or of sudden firing by a foreign fleet upon an American coast town, are clearly beside the point. Granted that either one of these two supposed provocations would necessarily result in war, there is nothing proved by the hypothetical case except what may happen under the *existing* order of things.

Under the domain of international arbitration, we scarcely see how either incident could occur as Mr. Roosevelt imagines it. The right of search at sea—supposing so wild a claim to be made by England—would necessarily go before a court of arbitration; the foreign government which may have had in mind the firing on our coast towns would, by the terms of the case, have bound itself to submit its grievances to arbitration before proceeding to such action. In short, these contentions of Mr. Roosevelt seem to us hardly worth serious discussion; they were pretty convincingly disposed of by ex-Secretary of State John W. Foster in his speech to the Peace Conference at Lake Mohonk,

last Thursday. Mr. Foster showed, with mingled severity and good nature, how completely Mr. Roosevelt's own attitude towards the arbitration matter during his Presidential career, was at variance with his present contentions. It is fair to say, however, that his further assertion, to the effect that "the United States ought never specifically to bind itself to arbitrate questions respecting its honor, independence and integrity," contains more serious food for reflection. That is the attitude always maintained by the late Lord Salisbury; it is undoubtedly the most awkward stumbling-block in the way of complete application of the arbitration principle. It will certainly draw to itself the chief part of legislative discussion over the proposed new treaty.

Now, in the first place, Secretary Knox's outline of our Government's proposals for arbitration abundantly covers this general question. One of two governments may oppose arbitration in a given case; if so, a committee of inquiry, composed of the two representatives of those governments in the Hague Tribunal, must agree before the matter is thus submitted. And even so, a special "treaty of reference" must be drawn up by our administration and approved by the United States Senate. This, of itself, leaves the "question of honor" largely open. We are quite aware that disputes or counter-claims may arise at any time between the nations which might involve these matters of "national honor." But the first question in the mind of unbiased men must be, Who shall decide whether such considerations are, or are not, involved? Mr. Roosevelt's reasoning leads nowhere, except to the old assumption that every nation must be a final judge for itself. Yet even so, it is not so certain what is or is not to be regarded as a "question of national honor or integrity." There is the case of Venezuela in 1895, when the position of our Government, in its communications with Great Britain, was certainly such as to have been interpreted, had England chosen, as an invasion of her national honor. Or, on the other hand, there is the recent case of readjusting the boundary between our possessions and northwestern Canada.

That, in substance, was a dispute on questions of national integrity; half a century ago a similar controversy gave rise to the popular outburst over the American claim, in the realignment of our northern boundary, which was voiced in the celebrated shibboleth of "Fifty-four-forty or fight." But every one knows how the Venezuela dispute and the recent Canadian boundary dispute were settled—the latter under the auspices of President Roosevelt—and the fact of their peaceable settlement throws considerable doubt upon the question whether any one can set up an absolute standard in such matters, save a qualified international court with reason, law, and precedent behind it. Not less important in propositions of this sort is the perfectly well-known fact of history that most wars over questions of this sort have been unnecessary, even for the purpose of achieving their avowed purpose. The passion of the moment, or the impulse, founded partly on excitement and partly on misinformation, was what usually plunged two nations into war, the result of which was frequently precisely what would have been obtained had a few weeks of peaceful negotiation been pursued. Such a check on popular passion would necessarily be provided by international arbitration treaties.

Mr. Hudson Maxim, in addressing the Economic Club last Monday on the same general question, brought up some other and not uninteresting considerations. His first objection is that "the nations of the earth will not unite, and cannot unite, for any purpose not prompted by individual self-interest." We doubt if any one will dispute the conclusion. It had, however, been our own impression that self-interest of the highest sort—social, political, and financial—was the force which is driving so many governments into consideration of this very arbitration question. Again, Mr. Maxim asks whether arbitration "will be able to see that all, even the meanest, get equal rights in the enjoyment of property, life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness." If not, arbitration "is destined to fail, and wars will still come."

Unless this question infers that governments, on the formation of a court of arbitration, will abandon their previous intervention in behalf of the individual rights of every citizen as against the outside world, it is difficult to see what force the objection has. If it means that every private petitioner in matters of this sort must be satisfied with the verdict as a condition for continuance of arbitration, then manifestly the suggestion is absurd. Precisely the same impossible condition of further existence might as easily be applied to the ordinary law court or to any settlement of any disputed question on any basis. Mr. Maxim's final argument in the matter was in substance an appeal to the somewhat worn-out catch words of advocates of war during many generations past. "The only rejuvenator of nations," he alleges—we are quoting the newspaper account of his speech—"has been the sword. War alone has swept away the unfit with their unfit laws and has given place to new and fitter blood and fitter laws."

We must confess that such an argument appeals to us as mere *reductio ad absurdum*. Is it true that war has always been so infallible a "rejuvenator"? One is reminded of the case of Poland; of the Thirty-Years' War, which devastated Europe to no purpose whatever, save the ruin of industry and the establishment of border anarchy; of the English War of the Roses, in which not one principle was involved of any serious interest to the people at large; of the Hundred-Years' War, pursued to establish a claim of the English crown on France, whose establishment, as all historians now admit, would have been the greatest of calamities for both nations; of the wars of Louis XIV, which were mere display of personal ambition; of the War of the Spanish Succession, an episode where the people's lives were made the stake of meddling secret intrigues by diplomatists; of the utterly futile and absurd Crimean War.

In not one of these affairs—which make up a good part of military history—did the appeal to arms result in the slightest degree in "rejuvenating." Their achievement lay much closer to the purpose of frank and brutal extermination. An eminent publicist, writing a quarter of a century ago, gave it as his deliberate opinion that only two just wars had been waged during the previous two centuries—the war of the American Revolution and the American Civil War. To this, we presume, most people nowadays would join the war of Japan against Russia. But the mere citation of the series of great wars is sufficient to prove not only that

the notion of the beneficent results of war *per se* is unfounded, but that the actual history of war—its causes, motives, incidents, and results—is the surest witness to the need of some international agreement which will restrain or stop it altogether.

Such comments as these may profitably be contrasted with Sir Wilfred Laurier's speech at the London banquet of last Tuesday. Canada and the United States, said the Canadian Premier, "show to the world two nations with the longest of all international boundaries—extending from ocean to ocean—living in peace and mutual respect without a fortress, a soldier, or a gun on either side of that boundary." If any one thinks that this happy condition of affairs has been possible because no controverted questions have arisen in the century past between Canada and this country, he will have studied to little purpose the history of the United States. What he is likely to learn from such study is that a very great part of this immunity from international collision has been made possible, first through constant and habitual recourse to arbitration of disputed questions, and, second, by the very fact of practical disarmament.—From the *Financial and Commercial Chronicle*.

### No More.

No more the world lifts laurel leaves to crown  
The wielder of the battle axe and spear.  
The trade that filled the earth with fear  
And robbed the mother of her hard-won prize—  
Her baby with the golden hair and eyes  
Just grown to manhood, fit for fair renown—  
The trade that wrecked with woe  
Wide fields all billowy with ripened grain,  
And turned the rivers' healing flow  
To currents red with wrathful stain—  
That trade is passing from the earth.  
No longer entered on with mirth,  
War now is known  
As thing the most obscene  
'Mong all the things terrene;  
A shame to be outgrown,  
Unmasked in all its evil mien;  
And conquerors are but butchers whose red hands  
No more triumphant wave through cheering lands,  
But nerveless fall, at love's divine commands.

—James H. West.

### The Flag.

There were three colors in the banner bright  
On which the maidens stitched and stitched all day.  
Their needles glanced, for with the morrow-light  
Each saw her hero-lover march away.  
  
Save one, the maidens stitched with fond, proud haste;  
And her they chide: "Why do thy fingers lag?  
Think but how fair will gleam by farm and waste  
The red, the white, the blue, of their loved flag."  
  
The maiden lifted not her hands, her eyes:  
"The red of flowing blood I see," she said;  
"The white of faces upturned to the skies,  
The blue of heaven wide above the dead."

Edith M. Thomas in *The Independent*.

### Forgive.

Oh, man, forgive thy mortal foe,  
Never strike him blow for blow;  
For all the souls on earth that live  
To be forgiven, must forgive.  
Forgive him seventy times and seven,  
For all the blessed souls in heaven  
Are both forgivers and forgiven.

—Alfred Tennyson.

### New Books.

A SHORT HISTORY OF WAR AND PEACE. By G. H. Perris. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 256 pages. Price, 75 cts. net.

This book, which might almost as well have been called "The Human Swarm, and How it Stopped Swarming," approaches the question of peace from a novel point of view. It will be read with instruction and pleasure by all those who are interested in the historic-evolutionary aspects of the problem of world peace. After expounding the manner in which, in the early ages, colonies were thrown off and new settlements formed, with such governments as this swarming process necessitated, Mr. Perris discusses in a summary but very forceful manner the way in which the first empires came into existence. He then devotes a chapter to the "Greek, Jew, and Christian," and their place and work in the processes of expansion and organization. A chapter is given to "The Strength of Rome," another to the interplay of the forces of war and peace in the Middle Ages, and another to the "Breakdown of Feudalism." After having traced the Westward swarm across European history, he takes up the passage of it across the Atlantic, into the Pacific, and around the African coast into the Indian seas. An equilibrium much wider and stronger than any of the previous ones now comes into existence—"a settlement shared in some measure by the whole world," "The Balance of Power." One chapter is devoted to Napoleon, a "terrific word." On the representative character of Napoleon, as Mr. Perris conceives him, many readers will put a big question mark. The latter part of the book is devoted to "The New Equilibrium" and the "Organization of Peace," and Mr. Perris' treatment of this is extremely well done, as indeed is his treatment of all the other subjects touched upon. There is not a dull page in the whole work, though there are a good many that cannot be read well without a considerable and fairly wide knowledge of history. Mr. Perris believes that the era of belligerent expansion is, for several reasons, practically over, and that "after many painful readjustments of political power" a civilization is at last being created by commerce and other agencies which is dependent upon both domestic and international peace. "The great task of the twentieth century, whether we regard domestic or external, moral or economic needs, is seen to be the removal of the fear of war and the burdens of preparation it entails, by the organization of a settled peace."